

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1-21, 23 and 32-39 are pending. The Examiner's reconsideration of the objection and rejections is respectfully requested in view of the amendments and remarks.

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's indication that claims 1-21 and 23 are allowed.

Claims 32-39 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The Examiner stated essentially that the use of the term "means" renders the claims indefinite due to the inability to determine which features or structures are being referenced. Claims 32-34 have been amended, and the term "means" has been deleted. Claims 35-39 depend from claim 32, but do not include the term "means." Thus, claims 35-39 are believed to be allowable for at least the reasons given for claims 32-34.

Claim 32 has been objected to, wherein the phrase "the first client" was indicated as lacking proper antecedent basis. Claim 32 has been amended to provide proper antecedent basis.

The Examiner's reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 32-39 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by "Socially Translucent Systems: Social Proxies, Persistent Conversation, and the Design of 'Babble'" (Erickson et al.). The Examiner stated essentially that Erickson teaches all the limitations of claims 32-39.

Claim 32 claims, *inter alia*, "specifying, by a first client, an access right of a second client to a communication channel, wherein the access right and the communication channel are specified in an electronic profile of the first client stored in a database connected to a network, and wherein the communication channel corresponds to a telephone number of the first client."

Erickson teaches a method for online community activity using chat based interactions (see “A Tour of the Interface” and Figure 3). Erickson does not teach a method for “specifying, by a first client, an access right of a second client to a communication channel” as claimed in claim 32. While a user of Erickson may join and leave groups making him or herself available, Erickson does not teach that a first user specifies an access right of a second user to a communication channel, essentially as claimed in claim 32. For example, according to Erickson, even where a first user makes himself unavailable by leaving a group, the group is still available to a second user. Thus, Erickson does not teach “specifying, by a first client, an access right of a second client to a communication channel” as claimed in claim 32. Therefore, Erickson fails to teach all the limitations of claim 32.

Claims 33-39 depend from claim 32. The dependent claims are believed to be allowable for at least the reasons given for claim 32. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 32-39 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Trovato et al. (USPN 6,425,012). The Examiner stated essentially that Trovato teaches all the limitations of claims 32-39.

Trovato teaches a method for allocating users to chat rooms, including determining a profile of a user (see col. 7, lines 16-26). Trovato does not teach “specifying, by a first client, an access right of a second client to a communication channel” as claimed in claim 32. According to Trovato, access is granted to each user based upon that users profile. Trovato does not teach that a first user specifies an access right of a second user to a communication channel, essentially as claimed in claim 32. Therefore, Trovato fails to teach all the limitations of claim 32.

Claims 33-39 depend from claim 32. The dependent claims are believed to be allowable for at least the reasons given for claim 32. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

For the forgoing reasons, the application, including claims 1-21, 23, and 32-39, is believed to be in condition for allowance. Early and favorable reconsideration of the case is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Nathaniel T. Wallace  
Reg. No. 48,909  
Attorney for Applicants

Mailing Address:  
**F. CHAU & ASSOCIATES, LLC**  
130 Woodbury Road  
Woodbury, New York 11797  
TEL: (516) 692-8888  
FAX: (516) 692-8889